The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO OF ILLINOIS AND CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE OF MASSACHUSETTS COSPONSOR HANDTOOLS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, which is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JAMES A. BURKE, on behalf of the handtool industry, to increase tariffs on imports of handtool items for a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1976, phased down to present levels after the third year.

Under the provisions of this bill, the International Trade Commission would keep developments in the domestic handtools industry under review and, upon request, would advise the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee of the probable economic effect on the industry of the termination of the increased tariffs after 5 years.

This bill is being introduced by us in response to the demonstrated inability of the handtools industry to obtain relief from import competition under existing law.

Twice in the past 2 years the industry has sought relief under the Antidumping Act from imports of various types of handtools from Japan. The Treasury Department determined on the basis of its investigation in both cases that such handtools were being dumped in the U.S. market by margins as large as 45 to 50 percent.

The International Trade Commission, however, found no injury or threat of injury to the domestic industry as a result of these imports, despite the increasing share of the market taken over by imports and a decline in industry profits. Consequently, no duties were imposed to compensate for the large margins of underselling through dumping.

Under the circumstances, the industry believes it would be fruitless to seek import relief under the normal procedures of the Trade Act of 1974. Since the International Trade Commission found no injury under the criteria of the Antidumping Act, it presumably would not find injury under the stiffer criteria of the Trade Act. Yet, there is a very substantial and steadily rising penetration of the U.S. market by foreign hand tools, particularly of those types which are most labor-intensive.

Domestic manufacturers who formerly produced their entire product line here have turned to importation of unfinished tools, which are then finished by minor processing operations in the United States and sold under American brand names. A Bureau of Customs ruling has exempted such tools from the requirements for marking to show the country of origin.

The bill which Congressman BURKE and I are introducing would provide some temporary relief for this industry and its workers to enable them to overcome foreign dumping and to adjust to import competition. What we need is more production for American workers and not less, and therefore, we urge enactment of this bill as quickly as possible.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRIVATE BANK RECORDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Supreme Court ruled that customers of the Nation's banks do not have an "expectation of privacy" with regard to records of their personal transactions which are held by their banks. This unfortunate ruling, which overturns a Court of Appeals decision, means that Government agencies will continue to have access to records of individual personal banking matters without notice being given to the citizen, and without opportunity to halt such access.

In this case, United States against Miller, the Court held that the subpenaed information was part of the bank's business records and not the customer's private papers. The Court further held that since checks are "negotiable instruments" and not subject to the protection of confidential communications, the Government is not required to meet a higher standard for their seizure from the bank than the simple subpena duces tecum.

I greatly regret the Court's limited view of the scope of the fourth amendment and the value of a public policy protecting third-party-held records from unannounced search and seizure by Government authorities.

The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Liberties, which I chair, has been very concerned with such invasions of privacy. After many months of hearings and arduous markup, we have reported a bill which, when enacted, will go a long way toward protecting the privacy of financial records held by third parties.

The bill, H.R. 214, the Right to Privacy Act, will permit Government access to bank, telephone, and credit card records only if the authorities have obtained the consent of the customer, obtained a search warrant, or served a subpena or summons on the bank or company with a copy to the customer. The customer would have standing to move to quash a subpena.

Mr. Speaker, the right to Privacy Act simply recognizes that private records held by third parties such as bank and credit card companies are a special class of records that we all are compelled to maintain in order to function in our society. These records provide a uniquely personal view of our lives including information about our associations, travel, political, and religious beliefs, as well as more mundane, but equally private affairs, such as where we shop, what we purchase and to whom we are indebted.

I believe that the Court has erred in holding that we have no expectation of privacy in these intimate records held by our banks. I urge my colleagues to study the legislation which I hope will soon be reported to the full House so that we may develop a public policy which more soundly reflects the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects.

I also commend to my colleagues' attention yesterday's editorial from the Washington Post on the Court's decision and the Right to Privacy Act:

THE NONPRIVACY OF BANK ACCOUNTS

The Supreme Court is continuing to interpret the right of privacy so narrowly as to give citizens little or no protection against governmental intrusion into many aspects of their everyday personal affairs. A notable example was the Court's 7-2 ruling on Wednesday that no constitutionally protected zone of privacy has been invaded when the government subpoenas records of a person's banking transactions from the bank.

The decision upheld the traditional view that the records of banks, like those of telephone companies, credit-card firms and other businesses, belong to the company, not the customer. Even though sensitive personal information is often involved, this approach gives the customer no right to intervene—or even to be notified—before the business opens up the records to a law-enforcement officer. In the case decided the other day, the citizen involved—who happened to be accused of operating an illegal still—claimed that his banks' compliance with federal subpoenas violated his expectation of privacy in dealing with the banks. A lower federal court had agreed, but the High Court did not.

The most disturbing aspect of this decision is the Court's refusal to recognize that banking involves any reasonable claims of confidentiality at all. Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., for one, seems to have modified his views along the way to this result. In an earlier case upholding government record-keeping rules, Justice Powell wrote, "Financial transactions can reveal much about a person's activities, associations and beliefs. At some point, governmental intrusion upon these areas would implicate legitimate expectations of privacy." The other day, however, Justice Powell wrote for the Court that checks and deposit slips "are not confidential communications but negotiable instruments" and "contain only information voluntarily conveyed to the banks and exposed to their employees in the ordinary course of business." Thus he concluded that no legitimate expectation of privacy is involved; on the contrary, any depositor "takes the risk" that a bank will share this information with the government.

That concept of the banking relationship is not, obviously, the one held by most bankers or most of their customers. The average citizen assumes that his transactions will be kept confidential, and that bank employees will use information about his accounts only for banking purposes. Even this limited disclosure is not entirely voluntary; as the California Supreme Court said recently, "it is impossible to participate in the economic life of contemporary society without maintaining a bank account." And it is precisely the "ordinary" kinds of personal business that should enjoy the most protection against improper or excessive scrutiny by government. By refusing to acknowledge any legitimate confidentiality in this field, the Court has left the privacy of a wealth of detailed information about virtually all Americans entirely in the hands of the banks and other

proposal. It is esesntial that we take no more time in informing the Mexican leaders of our commitment to stemming the flow of narcotics. The President's message is important in that it makes clear that narcotics control and drug abuse treatment are high priorities on our domestic and foreign policy agendas. I commend the President for his timely message and look forward to translating the U.S. Government's commitment into tangible programs.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCES BILL TO CUT CONGRESSIONAL, FEDERAL, AND MILITARY PENSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, no one can doubt the wisdom and justice of providing pensions to retired Federal employees. Likewise, a strong case can be made for the annual adjustment of those pensions to reflect increases in the cost of living. Under present law, however, Federal pensions are irresponsibly generous, serving only to fuel the spiral of Federal spending. And as we too well know, Federal spending, and more importantly, the level of the annual Federal debt, are tightly interwoven with the inflation that all citizens daily confront.

In 1962, Congress first mandated that Federal pensions should keep pace with the cost of living and provided for an automatic adjustment of benefits. The original formula was revised in 1969 when Congress enacted legislation which added an extra 1 percent to each cost-of-living adjustment that was triggered by an increase in the Consumer Price Index. This additional 1 percent was rationalized as a way to compensate for the time lag that occurs between the actual cost-of-living increase and the effective date of the adjustment. It has proven to be an unjustified and excessive provision. It has been added to the cost-of-living increases 10 times since its enactment. In just 6 years that extra 1 percent has already had a price tag of $11.2 billion in unfunded liability of the pension fund. If left unchecked this feature will add untold billions in future payments.

Moreover, according to the Civil Service Commission, since the 1-percent add-on was first instituted in 1969, Federal pensions have increased by 71 percent while the cost of living has risen 56 percent. There has been a 15 percent overcompensation.

Today I am introducing a bill to repeal the 1-percent add-on from the pension escalator and to suspend the escalator itself on each pension until future cost-of-living increases offset fully expenditures in excess of those which would have been required by the cost-of-living adjustment alone.

Under my bill a Federal or military retiree who retired in 1969 would not be eligible for a further pension increase until the CPI rose another 15 percentage points—that is to 71 percent. The Civil Service Commission estimate that over the next 5 years this bill would save $4.4 billion from Civil Service pensions alone. When military pensions are added in, the savings are nearly doubled. Let me point out that congressional pensions will be cut back equally by my bill.

I am encouraged by other initiatives to correct the pension drain on the budget. Our colleague, Chairman HENDERSON, of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, has introduced a bill that would eliminate the 1-percent add-on. Our distinguished colleague, the ranking Republican on the committee, ED DERWINSKI, cosponsored this important legislation. The House Armed Services Committee recently recommended that the add-on be eliminated for military retirees. And the House Budget Committee has recommended unanimously that the add-on be eliminated. These initiatives have been supported by the action of President Ford in his message to the Congress of March 24 calling for "elimination of the provision in Federal civilian and military retirement systems which over-compensates retirees for cost-of-living adjustments."

But simply to eliminate the add-on is not enough. We must act to adjust for overpayments that were made in the past. That is the purpose of my bill. For, difficult as it is to believe, it is actually possible for a retiree to be receiving a Federal pension larger than his salary was when he was working just a few years ago.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO "INDOOR FACILITIES" PROVISION OF H.R. 12234, LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will consider H.R. 12234, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and to establish a historic preservation fund. This bill constitutes the major Federal funding source for Federal, State, and local park and historic preservation and development efforts across the Nation. It is a most important bill with many good features, and deserves the support of the Members of the House.

I plan to offer an amendment, however, as an alternative to paragraph (10). The bill's current provision permits up to 25 percent of each State's grant allocation to be used for sheltering of swimming pools and ice skating rinks under certain conditions. The principal purpose of this provision is to extend the normal season of use of the facility—a laudable goal. While I agree with this objective, however, I object to this particular approach, as I believe it is a dangerous and unwarranted precedent to begin to apply the use of this fund, which has historically been dedicated to outdoor recreation, for that which constitutes indoor recreation purposes. The fund is already stretched too far for outdoor recreation needs, and cannot afford to begin funding indoor recreation projects, to which there would clearly be no limit of demand. Moreover, such federally financed indoor recreation facilities could become competitive with the efforts of private enterprise to supply indoor recreation facilities.

So strict is the resistance to allowing any current fund money to become a part of any permanent indoor facility development that, under current practice, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which administers the fund, does not now permit State and local governments to even use their own funds to permanently shelter any outdoor facilities constructed with money from the fund.

I feel that my amendment represents somewhat of a compromise, in that it would prohibit the direct use of any Federal funds for sheltering outdoor facilities, but would permit State and local governments to use their own funds to shelter a multitude of facilities—not limited to just swimming pools and ice skating rinks—which base facilities have heretofore or hereafter been constructed with fund money. My amendment will retain however, the same stipulations now in the bill—that the tests of severity of climatic conditions and the increased public use resulting therefrom must be met. However, the shetler could not be a permanently enclosed building so as to constitute a permanent indoor facility.

My amendment is substantially the same as language adopted earlier by the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee. The current bill language—allowing a direct 25 percent of Federal grant funds to be used—was adopted by a marginal full committee vote of 8 to 6.

I feel that the amendment I propose to offer on the House floor offers more latitude and should have more appeal to more interests then what is now in the bill. Moreover, it does not open up the fund to an unquenchable raid by indoor recreation interests.

I would appreciate support in adoption of this amendment. The text of the proposed amendment follows:

Page 4, line 13, delete all of paragraph (10) and insert in lieu the following:

"(10) In section 6(e)(2) change the period to a colon and insert the following:

"'*Provided*, That no assistance shall be available under this Act to enclose or shelter facilities normally used for outdoor recreation activities, but the Secretary may permit local funding to be used for sheltering of such facilities heretofore or hereafter constructed and associated with activities normally pursued outdoors in that area, if he determines that the severity of climatic conditions and the increased public use resulting therefrom justify such sheltering.'"

firms with which they deal. Many companies do regard this as a solemn trust; a growing number, for example, notify a customer when information about his account is demanded by the government. Others do not. Some do not even wait for proper subpoenas, but turn over information in response to the most casual request by law-enforcement officers. Thus individuals enjoy uneven protection at best, while the companies bear the burdens of trying to judge the propriety of official demands in cases they know little about.

Since the Court has refused to find any constitutional defect in this state of affairs, the remedy will have to come from Congress. After years of intermittent discussion, a House Judiciary subcommittee has recommended legislation that would insure citizens notice and a chance to challenge official demands for records of their dealings with financial institutions, telephone companies, credit-card issuers and the like. The notice requirement could be waived only if a judge found that advising the individual would seriously jeopardize the investigation of specified crimes. The bill (H.R. 214) ought to be passed. It would give force to the concept of confidentiality in everyday financial dealings which most people have been banking on, but which the high court has unaccountably failed to grasp.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE WEEK BEGINS IN WEST HARTFORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the people of West Hartford, Conn., have begun a week-long observance of the Holocaust, Nazi Germnay's systematic extermination of millions of innocent people, including 6 million Jews.

Three candles will be kindled in the opening ceremonies tonight. Two survivors of the Holocaust, one Jewish and the other Christian, will light the first two flames. The third will be kindled by a member of the town's Danish community, a symbolic reminder of the only country in Europe whose Jewish citizens were saved from Hitler by the loyalty and courage of their Christian neighbors.

Denmark was one of only two exceptions to the general rule that Hitler's "final solution" was carried out without significant resistance. The other exception was the Warsaw ghetto uprising, when the 60,000 surviving Jews of the ghetto turned on their executioners and fought, with only a few smuggled weapons, against S.S. tanks, artillery, flame throwers, and dynamite squads.

Elsewhere, the Jews of Hitler's Europe perished in silence. Their neighbors watched and did nothing as the Jewish residents of their towns and cities quietly disappeared. From the local police who conducted them to the trains to the switchmen who shunted those trains on to special tracks that led only to the death camps, a conspiracy of silence made the Holocaust possible.

Other massacres have sent shock waves around the world, but only scattered reports and vague hints appeared in the Western press, until the first extermination camps were liberated in 1945 by Allied troops. The whole system was based on secrecy. Himmler told his S.S. generals in 1943:

This is a page of glory in our history which has never been written and is never to be written.

With the dispassionate efficiency and technological skill of a civilized Western society, the barbed wire was strung from pole to pole, the gas chambers and crematoria were constructed, the gas was manufactured, the trains were allocated. Responsibility was diffused in such a way that no one had to admit the total guilt.

A whole structure of lies protected the delicate consciences of the executioners: both those who did the paperwork and those who actually fired the bullets and released the poison gas. Unpleasant words were avoided. "Final solution" came to mean mass murder. "Special action" meant the specific extermination of a village or ghetto. "Selection" was the grissly process that saved some camp prisoners for hard labor and sent the rest, including most of the women, children and old men, directly to the gas chambers. And the process of shipping the residents of an entire community to the death camps was disguised with words like "deportation," "resettlement," "evacuation", and "transport."

In the end, the final solution was a crime without passion: The organized murder of millions by government order and with the dutiful collaboration of decent, civilized people. It is frightening that such a crime could happen in our century. It is frightening that technology and science are no guarantee that brutality will not reemerge and engulf thousands, that technology can be used to isolate individuals from the consequences of their actions, that in the hands of determined and evil leaders, the whole structure of a society can be turned against innocent people.

"Holocaust Remembrance Week," is an opportunity to remember that human nature is not free from barbarism and hatred, but it also is an opportunity to remember that good people can resist the destructive forces unleashed by other men. Four thousand Danish Jews escaped death because they were protected by a genuinely civilized nation. Sixty thousand Polish Jews refused to go meekly to the grave, but resisted their oppressors with bravery. "Holocaust Remembrance Week" is dedicated to the future, with the hope that the future will be on the side of those who refused to acquiesce to the savagery of Hitler's New Order.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an editorial that appeared April 22 in the Jewish Ledger, a newspaper that serves the Jewish community in my State:

REMEMBER THE HOLOCAUST!

Since the end of World War II a word of complex origin used in relation to the Nazi treatment of peoples whom they did not like—over six million Jews, and some millions of Christians, who did not go along with Hitler's methods or philosophy—has come into general usage. It is being used constantly. The word is "Holocaust".

Presently there is an increasing demand that our young people be taught to know what the "Holocaust" means to us in Jewish history, and what it meant and means to society at large. We are all for it!

The word "holocaust" is, as we suggested above, of mixed origin—Greek, Latin and French. It refers to the ancient forms of worship, or to the worshiper who, either by himself or with the aid of a priest trained for that purpose, would kill a beast and place it upon the "altar of burnt offerings" and there allow the carcass to be completely burned. The word "holocaust" means "being burned whole".

Now, so far as we Jews are concerned, the word "holocaust", which currently refers to what the German Nazis and others did to Jews and non-Jews, represents a dark blotch on the record of this and immediately preceding generations. It has come to mean the effort that was made to make the world, to use the Hitler term "Judenrein"—purged of all Jews as an inferior, contemptuous, contemptible, expendable and indefensible group—in this instance, largely Jews no matter where they were or are.

We shall not attempt here to review the methodology, the brutality, the hate, the barbarism which the word "Holocaust" calls forth in our minds. We shall not attempt here to describe what it did to one-third of the total Jewish population in the world and to millions of non-Jews who were treated with equal degradation. We do not need to publicize the terrors to which whole populations had been subjected. Let the word "Holocaust", with a capital "H", continue to be the reminder of that dark period in human history and in our generation when Hitler and his minions were ravaging and raging in society.

And it is well that we Jews would especially remember to teach our children to remember and not to forget (it will not hurt them!) to know the story of the modern Holocaust, to learn of its tragedy, to learn of some of the heroics, to learn of the sacrifices of so many who did escape and survive. They should know and remember and set their minds and hearts in the direction in which they may become a consecrated dedicated, deeply committed generation who would try to establish human society today upon the level of humaneness and humanity and away from the level of bestiality, degeneracy and moral, spiritual decay. Perhaps then, when our younger generation becomes sufficiently aware of what "Holocaust" meant and what it could be again unless we beware—perhaps, then a later generation, our children's children, will so re-establish the world so that "Holocaust" joins the category of cannibalism, which has almost completely disappeared—certainly from civilized and most semi-civilized societies. They will then proceed to extend to all people, young and old, Jew and non-Jew, the thundering message, "Remember the Holocaust! Do not forget it"! Try to prevent its recurrence and maybe a later generation may not have to stand guard against the evils which the Holocaust has caused and may continue to do so unless prevented!!!

MATSUNAGA INTRODUCES SPEEDY TRIALS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1976

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, since crime became an issue of major national concern in the early 1960's, it has become increasingly clear that one of the most glaring deficiencies in our badly taxed criminal justice system is the inability of our courts to mete out the swift, sure punishment which serves as the most cogent lesson to the criminal, and the most effective deterrent to the would-be wrongdoer.

In a recent study the Department of Justice's Law Enforcement Assistance

Administration—LEAA—found that in some jurisdictions, the timelag between the crime and the prosecution of its perpetrators extended to over 1 year. The resultant threat both to the successful reduction of the crime rate, and to the maintenance of our civil liberties, can no longer be considered in anything less than a very serious light. Clearly, such a situation violates the Constitution's guarantee of every citizen's right to a speedy trial. Moreover, by not establishing for the criminal a clear, unmistakable connection between crime and punishment, and by hindering the successful prosecution of a crime, it encourages development of the habitual offender.

I believe that the problem has reached proportions which demand congressional initiative during the present Congress. To contribute to what I hope will be an extensive examination of this issue, I introduced yesterday H.R. 13282, my proposed Speedy Trials Assistance Act of 1976.

My proposed legislation is aimed at LEAA, the Federal agency which, since its creation under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, has pumped more than 4 billion Federal dollars into the improvement of our criminal justice system. LEAA, labeled by many as ineffective, is up for reauthorization this year, and is therefore the center of much of the current congressional debate regarding crime control.

My bill proposes to require three things of LEAA. They are: First, require LEAA to address itself specifically to the problem of trial delay; second, assure that the necessary funds with which to do so are available; and third, assure that those most familiar with the problems of trial delay are represented on panels charged with the distribution of LEAA funds.

Since its inception, the majority of LEAA funds have been allocated under a basic program of block grant funding of State crime control planning agencies—SPA's—whose crime control programs are approved by LEAA. With regard to crime control, I generally agree with such an approach, for it allows each State to apply LEAA funds to the areas which it considers most urgent. General problem areas to which the use of such funds must be directed are, however, spelled out in the law. The problem of trial delay is not one of these 10 areas. I propose to make it the 11th.

Despite my general agreement with the block grant approach, I find it very disturbing that the courts have always received the lowest priority in past LEAA funding. To assure that this situation changes, I am proposing that at least one-third of LEAA part C discretionary funds be expended on the problem of trial delay. Part C discretionary funds are not block grant funds, but are funds reserved by LEAA for direct application, independent of SPA's, to problem areas considered national in scope. LEAA can thereby provide leadership by testing innovative strategies without interfering with a particular State's needs and priorities. In fiscal year 1975, $88 million of LEAA's total crime allocation of $724 million were part C discretionary funds. I am greatly disturbed by the administration's fiscal year 1977 budget proposal suggestion that part C discretionary grants be reduced by nearly $10 million. I want to assure that the long-neglected problem of trial delay does not continue to bear the brunt of budget restraints.

Finally, I am proposing that at least two members of each SPA be selected from a list of persons nominated by that State's chief justice. Because a court system must be the best judge of its problems and possible avenues for improvement, I believe that SPA's, which decide to what specific areas most LEAA funds will be directed, will thereby become much more responsive to the problems of the courts.

The above-mentioned proposals are modest when the scope of the problem which we face is fully comprehended. However, I do believe that they can contribute significantly to a problem which can no longer be ignored, that of our overburdened court system. Accordingly, I commend my proposals to my colleagues' attention, with the hope that the proposals will receive serious consideration during the present debate on LEAA.

KISSINGER IN LUSAKA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger delivered a speech in Lusaka this morning on U.S. policy toward southern Africa. It is my hope that the words of this statement—some of which are indeed commendable—will be followed by swift, concrete action on the part of the Executive, which gives evidence of U.S. commitment to majority rule in southern Africa. Indeed, I know that a number of our colleagues will join me in watching closely to see that these words become actuality.

The United States is to be commended for such positive steps as its willingness to provide $12.5 million of assistance to Mozambique which has been faced with additional economic hardship as a result of the closing of its borders with Rhodesia to enforce U.N. sanctions.

With respect to the Secretary's statement that the Executive will "urge the Congress this year to repeal the Byrd amendment," I have today called upon President Ford and the Republican leadership in both Houses of Congress to bring the full weight of the White House and all executive agencies in a concerted, unified effort to obtain repeal in the Congress.

I would like to insert, for the consideration of my colleagues, the text of Secretary Kissinger's statement in Lusaka, and the text of my telegram to President Ford:

TELEGRAM DATED APRIL 27, 1976

Hon. GERALD R. FORD,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Following Secretary of State Kissinger's statement today in Lusaka reaffirming the administration's commitment to "take steps to fulfill completely its obligation under international law to mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia." And to "urge the Congress this year to repeal the Byrd amendment," I call upon you to request immediately the minority leadership in both Houses, Representatives John J. Rhodes, John B. Anderson and Barber B. Conable, Jr., and Senators Hugh Scott, Robert P. Griffin, and John Towers to introduce legislation forthwith repealing the Byrd amendment, and to bring the full weight of the White House and all executive agencies in a concerted, unified effort to obtain repeal in the Congress.

With this evidence of genuine administration support, you can expect the full involvement of the Black Caucus and other Members of Congress who have worked on repeal efforts in the past.

Last September's 209–187 vote sustaining the Byrd amendment in the House of Representatives involved 105 opponents from your own party including the House minority leadership. It is because of this defection from the stated administration position on the Byrd amendment last year that I feel constrained to say that warmed-over promises without concrete evidence of the administration's unified backing means nothing and are bound to fail.

I commend you on the positive statement on African policy made by the Secretary at this critical juncture in U.S.-African relations and urge you to move swifty to implement fully the actionable items in his Lusaka message.

CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER, AT A LUNCHEON IN THE SECRETARY'S HONOR, HOSTED BY HIS EXCELLENCY KENNETH KAUNDA, PRESIDENT OF ZAMBIA, APRIL 27, 1976

INTRODUCTION

President Ford has sent me here with a message of commitment and cooperation.

I have come to Africa because in so many ways, the challenges of Africa are the challenges of the modern era. Morally and politically, the drama of national independence in Africa over the last generation has transformed international affairs. More than any other region of the world, Africa symbolizes that the previous era of world affairs—the colonial era—is a thing of the past. The great tasks you face—in nation-building, in keeping the peace and integrity of this continent, in economic development, in gaining an equitable role in world councils, in achieving racial justice—these reflect the challenges of building a humane and progressive world order.

I have come to Africa with an open mind and an open heart to demonstrate my country's desire to work with you on these great tasks. My journey is intended to give fresh impetus to our cooperation and to usher in a new era in American policy.

The United States was one of the prime movers of the process of decolonization. The American people welcomed the new nations into the world community and for two decades have given aid and encouragement to economic and social progress in Africa. And America's responsibilities as a global power give us a strong interest today in the independence, peace and well-being of this vast continent comprising a fifth of the world's land surface. For without peace, racial justice and growing prosperity in Africa, we cannot speak of a just international order.

There is nothing to be gained in a debate about whether in the past America has neglected Africa or been insufficiently commited to African goals. The United States has many responsibilities in the world. Given the burden it has carried in the postwar period, it could not do everything simultaneously. African nations too have their